

REMARKS

The Examiner indicated that claims 8, 16, 47, and 54 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowed subject matter.

The Examiner objected to claims 9, 26, 58, and 59 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter and have accordingly rewritten claims 9, 26, 58, and 59 in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, 23-25, 28-34, 36-41, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60-69, 72 and 74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Beaman et al. and Sinclair.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 12, 35, 44, 45, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Li, Beaman and Sinclair as in claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 32-34, and 37-42, in view of Voltz.

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 22, 71 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li, Beaman and Sinclair as in claims 1, 4, 5-7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21, 23-25, 28-34, 36-38, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60-69, and 72, in view of Chan et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 48, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li, Beaman and Sinclair as in claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 32-34, and 37-42, in view of Kresge et al.

In a telephone conversation between the Examiner Ross Gushi and Applicants' Representative Jack P. Friedman on June 23, 2004, the Examiner agreed that if the rejected

09/975,213

18

independent claims were canceled and if the rejected dependent claims were each amended to depend from an allowed claim, then all of the claims would be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants have canceled the rejected independent claims 1 and 43, and amended the rejected dependent claims to each depend from an allowed claim. As discussed in said telephone conversation, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' Representative Jack P. Friedman if the Examiner should find any errors in the amendment of the claims herein.

In light of the amendment herein, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are moot.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 06/23/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/975,213

19